

**Univerzita Karlova v Praze**

Filozofická fakulta

Ústav lingvistiky a ugrofinistiky

obecná lingvistika – klasická filologie

Dana Lüder

**Anaforické prvky v latině**

**Anaphoric items in Latin**

Teze k disertační práci

vedoucí práce: Prof. PhDr. Bohumil Palek, DrSc.

2007

The aim of the dissertation is to analyze the use of anaphoric items in Latin according to Chomsky's Binding Theory and to demonstrate limitations of this theory, when applied to Latin. Further, principles and tendencies of a different nature governing the use of Latin anaphoric items in texts are examined.

## **Chapter 1: General description of the phenomenon of anaphora**

In Chapter 1, different analyses of anaphora, as they were provided in the history of linguistics, with emphasis on the modern anaphora research, are presented. Of course the overview is by no means complete. There exists very rich literature on the topic and it is neither possible nor meaningful to attempt to include all of them.

Anaphora theories are divided into two groups. First of them contains conceptions which start with the analysis of anaphoric items and afterwards examine their functioning in texts. Traditional approaches belong to this group. Special attention is paid to N. Chomsky's Binding Theory. Based on Chomsky, T. Reinhart and E. Reuland (1993) developed an alternative theory which aims to explain issues of reflexive binding that are not captured by Binding Theory. Another interesting approach is pragmatic theory of anaphora in terms of Grice's theory of meaning and communication and based on Chinese by Y. Huang (1994). My work can be included into this group.

Second type of approach starts with an analysis of overall cohesive relations in texts, of which anaphoric relations are a part. Under this approach, text and relations in the text are the point of departure and items entering and creating these relations are identified after the relations have been defined. Works written in lines of textual linguistics belong to this group. The most influential of them is M. A. K. Halliday's and R. Hasan's work on cohesion (Halliday, Hasan (1976)). An important structuralist approach which includes the whole range of anaphoric phenomena is provided by B. Palek (1968) and (1988). Further, the analysis of the use of pronouns in texts by R. Harweg (1968) and dynamic interpretation of texts by M.-E. Conte (1994) are mentioned. Finally, T. Givón's functionalist approach is presented according to Givón (1995).

For my research, the most important of the works included in Chapter 1 is Chomsky's Binding Theory, which is the basis of the discussion. Works by B. Palek provide many useful insights. The interaction between *pro*, pronouns and R-expressions in Latin has been largely studied from the functionalist point of view (especially in works by A. M. Bolkestein). Other approaches mentioned in Chapter 1 are of rather illustrative character and do not have any relevant impact on my own research.

## Chapter 2: Anaphoric items in Latin

Chapter 2 represents the main part of the work. It is devoted to the description of functioning of anaphoric items in Latin. The discussion is based on Chomsky's Binding Theory, as was presented by Haegeman (1994). Following groups of anaphoric items are differentiated, according to Binding Principles which they are subject to<sup>1</sup>:

(1)

	Overt items	Empty items
<b>Principle A</b>	reflexives, reciprocals	NP-traces
<b>Principle B</b>	pronouns	<i>pro</i>
<b>Principle C</b>	R-expressions	wh-traces
<b>Principle A&amp;B</b>	---	PRO

All items from (1) except traces are included into the analysis.

The notion of trace is based on the concept of movement developed in configurational languages where NPs overtly occur in a position different from that in which they are base-generated. Movement is supposed to be triggered by independent, yet theory-internal reasons (e. g. Case assignment). I am not sure whether it is appropriate to use this concept in non-configurational languages, too; especially Latin shows a great extent of word-order variability, which is influenced by reasons originating in informational-structure considerations which are not included in GB-framework. Movement types and possibilities would have to be dramatically broadened to account for Latin word-order options. Therefore it is questionable whether word-order variants should be ascribed to movement or rather another mechanism which would have to be specified.

In non-configurational languages, the term of *proto-sentence*, in the sense of “abstract” word order capturing relations between clause members without respect to their surface order, as introduced e. g. in Palek (1989) seems to be more appropriate.

In Latin, SOV is the supposed basic word order. I adopt this assumption in my work and I do not discuss word order except occasional remarks.

**Reflexives** are traditionally divided into so-called direct and indirect reflexives. “Direct” reflexives have their antecedents inside the clause, i. e. they are local, antecedents of

---

<sup>1</sup> In fact, the differentiation is done according to features [ $\pm$  anaphoric] and [ $\pm$  pronominal]; however, I use the original classification according to Binding Principles in my work.

“indirect” reflexives are outside the clause. I use the labels “local” and “logophoric” reflexives instead.

Local reflexives have both subject and non-subject antecedents. With subject antecedents, they obey Principle A, as required by Binding Theory:

- (2) [...] *reliqui<sub>i</sub> sese<sub>i</sub> fugae mandarunt [...]* (Caes. B Gall. 1, 12, 3)  
 remaining:NP themselves:AP flight:DS betook:3P  
 “the rest betook themselves to flight, [...]”

Non-subject antecedents violate Principle A because they do not c-command the reflexive and the choice of antecedent proceeds according other than syntactic criteria. Such cases were discussed above all by A. Bertocchi (1989). She provides several hypotheses solving this problem. Each of the hypotheses covers a different set of examples. According to first of them, antecedent can be determined on the basis of its theta-role, which is Agent or Experiencer:

- (3) *homines [quos<sub>i</sub> infamiae suae; neque pro<sub>exp</sub><sup>2</sup> pudeat neque pro<sub>exp</sub> taedeat]*  
 (Cic. Verr. a. pr. 35, quoted in Bertocchi 1989:448)  
 people:NP whom:AS dishonor:GS self’s:GS neither shame:3S nor abominate:3S  
 “people who are neither ashamed nor weary of their own dishonor”,

or according to its role in the informational structure of the sentence – it can be Topic or Contrast. This last issue concerns possessive reflexives which can occur in positions of [Spec, NP]. Often, they are interpreted as “pseudo-reflexives” or “emphatic possessives” with reflexive form but not value:

- (4) [...] *Pompeio<sub>i</sub> [sua<sub>i</sub> domus] patebit [...]* (Cic. Phil. 13, 10)  
 Pompeius:DS self’s:NS house:NS open:3SFut  
 “[...] his own house will be open to Pompeius [...]”

The third solution by Bertocchi (1989), the so-called transformational hypothesis which supposes the reflexive to be bound by the antecedent in the course of transformational history:

- (5) *A Caesare<sub>i</sub> valde liberaliter pro<sub>j</sub> invitor [...]* *sibi<sub>i</sub> ut pro<sub>j</sub> sim legatus* (C. Att. 2, 18, 3)  
 by Caesar:AbS very kindly pro invite:1SPass self:DS that pro be:1SSub legate:NS  
 “I am invited by Caesar in a very gentlemanly manner [...] to act as legatus to himself”

---

<sup>2</sup> Expletive *pro*.

This hypothesis must, however, be abandoned on the basis of counterexamples as

- (6) [...] a me **pro**; *diligitur propter summam suam; humanitatem* [...] (Cic. Fam. 15, 14, 1)  
from me:AbS pro loved:3SPass because-of highest:AS his:AS humanity:AS  
“he has been [...] valued by me for his exceeding kindness [...]”

Unfortunately, my research does not enable me to provide a solution which would explain all antecedency possibilities of local reflexives on a uniform basis.

As for logophoric contexts, i.e. such which contain the speaker’s commitment, according to Bertocchi (1994), the special case of indirect speech is analyzed more particularly. In Latin indirect speech, logophoric reflexives are used instead of non-reflexive items which would occur at the same place if the proposition were expressed non-logophorically. The antecedent of logophoric reflexives in indirect speech can be identified unambiguously, differently from local reflexives. It is determined semantically as the participant-speaker<sup>3</sup> of the indirect speech, irrespective of its syntactic role. E. g.

- (7) I. *Ei legationi Ariovistus; respondit:*  
II. *si quid ipsi; a Caesare; opus esset, sese; ad eum; venturum fuisse;*  
III. *si quid ille; se; velit, illum; ad se; venire oportere.* (Caes. B Gall. 1, 34, 2)

“I. To this embassy Ariovistus replied,  
II. that if he himself had had need of any thing from Caesar, he would have gone to him;  
III. and that if Caesar wanted any thing from him he ought to come to him.”

In logophoric contexts, both local and logophoric reflexives may occur. The differentiation between them mostly depends on the receiver’s background knowledge and/or his knowledge gained from the previous text. Their antecedents are then determined by different mechanisms, as they were described for local and logophoric reflexives.

- (8) I. *Ad haec Ariovistus; respondit:*  
II. [...] *quod sibi; Caesar; denuntiaret*  
III. [*se; Haeduorum iniurias non neglecturum;*]  
IV. *neminem; secum; sine sua; pernicie contendisse.* (Caes. B Gall. 1, 36, 1+6)

“I. To this Ariovistus replied: [...]  
II. As to Caesar's threatening him,  
III. that he would not overlook the wrongs of the Aedui,  
IV. [he said] that no one had ever entered into a contest with him [Ariovistus] without utter ruin to himself.”

---

<sup>3</sup> I differentiate between *author of text* and *participant-speaker*, i. e. the speaker of the indirect speech.

I have found two structural constraints put on the use of reflexives in indirect speech. First of them occurs in periphrastic passive construction whose Agent is always expressed by reflexive, bound by the subject of matrix verb. Cf.

- (9) I. *Haec cum pro; animadvertisset, [...] vehementer eos; pro; incusavit:*  
 II. *primum, quod aut quam in partem aut quo consilio pro; ducerentur [[sibi; quaerendum aut cogitandum] pro; putarent.]*  
 III. *Ariovistum se; consule cupidissime populi Romani amicitiam adpetisse;*  
 (*Caes. B Gall. 1, 40, 1 - 2*)

**II. first:AS as-for or which:AS into part:AS or which:AS intention:AS pro lead:3PPass [[self:DP inquiring:Ger or conjecturing:Ger] pro think:3P]**

- “I. When Caesar observed these things, [...] he severely reprimanded them,  
 II. particularly, for supposing that it belonged to them to inquire or conjecture, either in what direction they were marching, or with what object.  
 III. That Ariovistus, during his [Caesar's] consulship, had most anxiously sought after the friendship of the Roman people;”

The other constraint concerns AcI<sup>4</sup>-constructions used in indirect speech. The seemingly non-local reflexives which are in their subject positions and whose antecedent is matrix subject are accounted for by Binding Theory. They are argued to be local because infinitive construction itself cannot be governing category. Governing category must be broadened to contain also matrix clause, and consequently reflexives in subject position of AcI-constructions are local and fulfill the requirements of Principle A. (Cf. (8)[II] – [III].)

In Binding Theory, **reciprocals** are claimed to be subject to Principle A together with reflexives. However, I argue that this supposition is conditioned by the nature of (in comparison with Latin simple) English reflexives, and further by the fact that reciprocal relation is strictly predicate-bound. From these facts the Binding Theory requirement on locally bound reciprocals results.

On the basis of Latin data, I claim that it is necessary to differentiate between two “facets” of reciprocity: (1) “locality” with respect to the predicate and (2) conditions put on anaphoric items contained in reciprocity markers<sup>5</sup>, whereas anaphoric part is a non-obligatory constituent of the relation and depends on the characters of reciprocity marker.

---

<sup>4</sup> *Accusativus cum infinitivo* in the traditional terminology. The term denotes embedded infinitive construction with an overt subject in Accusative. Cf. below.

<sup>5</sup> I do not use the term *reciprocal* because it is used in Binding Theory and implies local binding. Instead, the term *reciprocity marker* has been introduced which includes all lexical items expressing reciprocity, irrespective of their anaphoric characterization.

With respect to anaphoricity, Latin reciprocity markers can be classified in the following way: there are locally bound reciprocity markers (*inter se* (“between/among self”); reflexives used reciprocally), further reciprocity markers which contain pronouns that are free in their governing category (two pronouns creating a reciprocity marker; *inter ipsos* (“between/among self”)), and also reciprocity markers which are free according to Principle C (two R-expressions creating a reciprocity marker). There exists also a non-nominal reciprocity marker *invicem*. Finally, the crucial role played by predicate is shown by the existence of cases where no explicit reciprocity marker is present, and yet the example is interpreted reciprocally. A special case of reciprocity marker is two pronouns which can (despite pronouns’ underlying Principle B) have a local antecedent – it is then interpreted as a “unitary” reciprocity marker which is taken either to be non-pronominal and subject to Principle A, or, rather, non-nominal and not to be subject to Binding Theory at all, in spite of its form. E. g.

- (10) [...] **qui** *noxii ambo alter in alterum causam conferant*, [...] (*Liv. 5, 11, 6*)  
 who:NP guilty:NP both:NP other:NSM into other:ASM cause:AS throw:3P  
 “for whilst both were guilty, each threw the blame on the other,”

From the logical point of view, eight types of reciprocity are distinguished according to Langendoen (1978). When trying to determine the type of reciprocity used in Latin examples, it turned out that there exists great vagueness in language if we attempt to classify natural language examples according to the logical classification of reciprocal relations. Nevertheless, it can be tentatively said that the choice of reciprocity marker is influenced by the type of reciprocity which is intended. However, more general conclusions can hardly be drawn as the decision as for the type of reciprocity is imprecise, and more examples would be necessary.

It seems that natural language usually does not exhaust all logical possibilities of reciprocity. Moreover, some degree of vagueness seems to be present almost without exception. I am not sure to what measure logically possible reciprocity types can be realized in natural language. It seems to depend strongly on cognitive abilities of speakers.

*pro*, the empty subject of finite clauses, is frequently used in Latin. Principles and tendencies governing its coindexation in sentences and texts are of different nature – lexical, syntactic, semantic, pragmatic or dependent on the text itself.

The most important term which has been introduced in connection with *pro* is *prominent participant*. It is characterized in the following way: (a) it was already introduced in the

text by means of a definite noun phrase<sup>6</sup>; (b) very often, it is subject; (c) there is no participant with different denotation nearby (the occurrence of such a participant would cancel the prominence of the participant in question); (d) individual occurrences are not far away from each other (it would cancel the prominence as well); (e) it is usually human; (f) prominency is only introduced after the participant has occurred overtly in topic position. *pro* is unmarkedly used to denote prominent participants. (Cf. (24), where also the cancellation of prominency by violating (d) and re-introduction of the participant by means of an R-expression are illustrated.) (24) further shows the necessity of the participant's being in topic position according to (f), cf. its being denoted by the pronoun *is* in topic position in [II] after it has been introduced by a proper noun in [I]).

Except the general requirement of prominency there exist many other constraints governing the antecedent resolution of *pro*. Some of them were examined more profoundly.

First, constraints of predicate referential structure are dealt with. In embedded clauses after certain verbs, called “*pro*-control verbs” here, *pro* must be used. Matrix verb determines whether *pro* is coindexed with matrix subject or object:

- (11) *in eo itinere pro persuadet Castico Catamantaloedis filio Sequano<sub>i</sub>, [...], ut regnum in civitate sua pro<sub>i</sub> occuparet, [...]* (Caes. B Gall. 1, 3, 4)<sup>7</sup>

on this journey *pro* persuades:3S Casticus:DS Catamantaloedes:GS son:DS Sequanus:DS [that sovereignty:AS in state:AbS self's:AbS *pro* get-hold:3S]

“On this journey he persuades Casticus, the son of Catamantaledes (one of the Sequani, [...]), to seize upon the sovereignty in his own state, [...]”

An important syntactic constraint works in coordinate and asyndetical constructions. Interpretation of *pro* is governed by a strict rule which requires *pros* in second (and following) clauses of the construction to be coindexed with the subject of the first clause. Change of participant must be signaled by the use of an overt NP or a pronoun (but see below about *ipse*).

- (12) I. *Proximo die instituto suo Caesar<sub>i</sub>, ex castris utrisque copias suas eduxit*  
 II. *paulumque a maioribus castris progressus aciem pro<sub>i</sub> instruxit*  
 III. *hostibusque pugnandi potestatem pro<sub>i</sub> fecit.* (Caes. B Gall. 1, 50, 1)

I. The next day, according to his custom, Caesar led out his forces from both camps,  
 II. and having advanced a little from the larger one, drew up his line of battle,

<sup>6</sup> In the type of texts examined, it is usually introduced by a proper noun.

<sup>7</sup> A note should be made on the position of *pro* in the examples. As I do not attempt to analyze Latin word order, I decided to place it directly in front of the verb, without making any claim as to its relative position to the other arguments and adjuncts of the verb



III. and gave the enemy an opportunity of fighting.”

Subordinate constructions were dealt with as well; however, only simple constructions with one embedded clause were included<sup>8</sup>. Mutual position of matrix and embedded clause and the use of overt NPs (or pronouns) and *pro* in different combinations were examined. It seems that only one construction is excluded, namely cataphora with the structure \* $[_{IP} \text{pro}_i \text{ VP } [_{CP} \text{NP}_i \text{ VP}]]$ .

Other structures and different combinations of *pro* and overt NP or pronoun in both matrix and embedded clauses could be demonstrated or it could be at least convincingly proved that the absence of a construction does not necessarily mean its inexistence. Other factors (e. g. use of modal verbs, adverbs, different  $\phi$ -features of *pros*, simultaneity/posteriority of actions etc.) were not included into the analysis.

Semantic, pragmatic and contextual considerations are rather supporting factors which “check” the coindexation gained on the basis of other factors.

When analyzing **PRO**, the empty subject of infinitive constructions, first a general analysis of Latin infinitive constructions is necessary. Infinitive constructions can be both embedded and non-embedded, both of them having empty and overt subjects; these can be either in Nominative or in Accusative.

Embedded constructions with overt accusative subject, *Accusative cum infinitivo* in traditional grammar, must be differentiated from the viewpoint of GB-Theory into two structures. If matrix verb is transitive, the construction is an object-control structure:

- (13) [...] *pro iubet eum<sub>i</sub> de litteris publicis in absentem Sthenium PRO<sub>i</sub> dicere* (Cic. Verr. 2, 38, 92)  
“he bids him make his statement about the public documents against Sthenius in his absence.”

If matrix verb is intransitive, the construction is an AcI-construction, where the accusative NP is subject of the embedded clause:

- (14) *Dico [Marcus esse bonum]*. (example by Maraldi (1980): 65)  
say:1S Marcus:AS be:I good:AS  
“I say that Marcus is good.”

---

<sup>8</sup> Note that in high literary style, it is possible to use (in comparison with modern Indo-European languages extremely) complex embedding structure, traditionally called “periods”.

In constructions with overt subjects, a problem arises with respect to Case assignment to the embedded subject. Maraldi (1983) supposes Latin infinite Infl to be “enriched” in comparison with the English one and to have the facility to assign Case to subjects of infinitive constructions. The problem is that both Nominative and Accusative Cases are assigned in non-embedded constructions without any structural difference which would motivate the decision between the two Cases. Cf. an example of exclamatory infinitive (non-embedded infinitive construction with an overt subject in Accusative):

- (15) *Tene [...] potissimum tibi partis istas depoposcisse [...]?* (Cic. Rosc. Am. 95)  
 you:AS-Pt most-likely you:DS part:AP this:AP have-selected:I  
 „you [...], should select this part above all others for yourself, [...]“

versus historical infinitive (non-embedded infinitive construction with an overt subject in Nominative):

- (16) *interim cotidie Caesar Haeduos frumentum [...] flagitare* (Caes. B Gall. 1, 16, 1)  
 meanwhile daily Caesar:NS Aedui:AP corn:AS demand:I  
 “meanwhile Caesar was dunning the Haedui daily for the corn”

However, the “enriched-Infl” hypothesis does not hold if examples of NcI<sup>9</sup>-constructions are taken into account. Movement of the embedded subject into matrix subject position is then unmotivated (cf. (14)):

- (17) *Marcus<sub>i</sub> dicitur [t<sub>i</sub> bonus esse]* (example from Maraldi (1980): 66)  
 Marcus:NSM say:3SPass good:NSM be:I  
 „Marcus is said to be good.“
- (18) *pro<sub>expl</sub> Dicitur [Marcum bonum esse]* (example from Maraldi (1980): 66)  
 e say:3SPass Marcus:ASM good:ASM be:I  
 „It is said that Marcus is good.“

The situation in infinitive constructions is rather complex with respect to Case assignment and at present, I have no plausible explanation to offer.

PRO in Latin infinitive constructions has been shown to be anaphoric<sup>10</sup> or non-anaphoric (i. e. expletive<sup>11</sup>). Anaphoric PRO can be either controlled, as Control Theory requires,

<sup>99</sup> *Nominativus cum infinitivo*: an embedded infinitive construction with matrix verb *dicendi* and raised subject of the infinitive into the position of matrix subject where it is assigned Nominative by the finite Infl.

<sup>10</sup> *Anaphoric PRO* is my term.

<sup>11</sup> PRO with arbitrary reference, i. e. non-anaphoric, was not discussed.

i. e. its antecedent<sup>12</sup> is determined by the control properties of the matrix verb, or not controlled. A tentative overview of subject-control verbs in Latin is provided (without however claiming completeness). Subject-control verbs are semantically defined as verbs which in some way specify or modify the way of carrying out the action expressed by the embedded verb or such that express the attitude of the subject towards the action. A classification of these verbs by Kühner, Stegmann (1912b) was introduced, including (a) „*Verben des Wünschens und Strebens*“, (b) „*Verben des Denkens und Beabsichtigens, Wagens und Beschließens*“, (c) „*Verben des Anfangens und Aufhörens, Fortfahrens und Beharrens, sich Gewöhnens und Pflegens*“, and (d) „*Verben des Könnens, Müssens, Sollens und des Gegenteils*“ (including also modal verbs). E. g.

- (19) [...] **pro**<sub>i</sub> *maturat ab urbe* **PRO**<sub>i</sub> *proficisci* [...] (Caes. B Gall. 1, 7, 1)  
 pro hasten:3S from city:AbS PRO set-out:I  
 “[...] he hastens to set out from the city [...]”

Object-control constructions are usually introduced by verbs *imperandi*, cf. (13).

Examples of uncontrolled, yet anaphoric PRO show that antecedent of PRO can be determined in other terms than those of Control Theory: it can be determined structurally, without however c-commanding PRO (after verbs with EXPERIENCER arguments in Dative):

- (20) *Caesari nuntiatu*r **Helvetiis**<sub>i</sub> *esse in animo per agrum Sequanorum et Haeduorum iter in Santonum fines* **PRO**<sub>i</sub> *facere*, [...] (Caes. B Gall. 1, 10, 1)

Caesar:DS announce:3SPass Helvetii:DP be:I in mind:AbS through district:AS Sequani:GP and Aedui:GP route:AS in Santones:GP territory:AP PRO make:I

“It is told Caesar, that the Helvetii intended to march through the country of the Sequani and the Aedui into the territories of the Santones, [...]”

Antecedent can be determined also non-structurally, on the basis of information from context:

- (21) I. **mihi**<sub>i</sub> *vero et locum quem opto ad id quod volumus dederis* [...].  
 II. *nam illa Sili et Drusi non satis* οἰκοδεσποτικὰ *mihi videntur*.  
 III. *quid enim?* **PRO**<sub>i</sub> *sedere totos dies in villa?*  
 IV. *ista igitur malim, primum Othonis, deinde Clodiae.* (Cic. Att. 12, 44)

(About buying a country house)

“I. For myself, you will have secured for me not only a site for the purpose I have at heart, but also a solace for my old age.

<sup>12</sup> I use the term *antecedent* instead of the usual *controller*, in order to account also for the anaphoric properties of non-controlled PRO.

- II. For the properties of Silius and Drusus do not seem to me to be sufficiently suited to a paterfamilias.  
 III. What! spend whole days in the country house!  
 IV. My preference therefore is-first Otho's, second Clodia's.”

**Pronouns** have been only shortly discussed. No full analysis could be provided because of the great extent and complexity of the issue. Only some isolated pieces of knowledge are presented which were gained by the examination of a corpus based prevailingly on the first two books of Caesar's *Commentarii de bello Gallico*. They have the character of tendencies rather than regularities and should be considered as a basis of future research.

Possibilities of pronominal and empty postcedents inside sentences and across sentence boundary were demonstrated. It is clear that the non-marked choice for subject postcedents is *pro*, this fact showing clearly that it is not possible to analyze the use of pronouns as isolated from other anaphoric items.

*Ipsē* (“self”) is said to be an “intensifying” pronoun in traditional grammar. It was shown that it has a special character with respect to anaphoricity, namely that it is used to denote prominent participant. It is a property that *ipse* shares with *pro* and that differentiates *ipse* from all other anaphoric pronouns. The difference between *ipse* and *pro* consists in the fact that *ipse* expresses contrast or stress in addition to prominency, which cannot be done by *pro*. It seems, however, that this hypothesis holds predominantly intrasententially.

- (22) *qua de causa Helveti<sub>i</sub>, quoque reliquos Gallos virtute praecedunt, quod fere cotidianis proeliis cum Germanis pro<sub>i</sub> contendunt, cum aut suis finibus eos pro<sub>i</sub> prohibent aut ipsi<sub>i</sub> in eorum finibus bellum gerunt. (Caes. B Gall. 1, 1, 4)*

“for which reason the Helvetii also surpass the rest of the Gauls in valor, as they contend with the Germans in almost daily battles, when they either repel them from their own territories, or **themselves** wage war on their frontiers.”

The three demonstrative/anaphoric pronouns *hic* (“this”), *iste* (“that”) and *ille* (“that”) are in their demonstrative use organized according to spatial principle, which is reflected also in their anaphoric use. *Hic* is connected with the speaker and his sphere, *iste* belongs to the addressee, and *ille* denotes objects which are distant or opposite from the speaker.

*Hic* has been shown to occur rather intersentionally than inside sentences. It is also frequently used to make up plural postcedents from several (singular or plural) antecedents, often in connection with *omnes* (“all”). Its antecedent is mostly relatively close in the text.

Surprisingly, *ille* did not occur intersententially except when both antecedent and postcedent are subjects. However, my rather limited corpus does not allow making more general conclusions.

*Hic* and *ille* are used together to differentiate two antecedents similarly to the English *the former* and *the latter*. In fact, the spatial principle of their demonstrative use is applied to their anaphoric use:

- (23) I. *Caesar*<sub>i</sub> *beneficiis ac munificentia magnus habebatur, integritate vitae Cato*<sub>j</sub>.  
 II. *Ille*<sub>i</sub> *mansuetudine et misericordia clarus factus,*  
 III. *huic*<sub>j</sub> *severitas dignitatem addiderat. (Sall. Cat. 54, 3)*

“I. Caesar grew eminent by generosity and munificence; Cato by the integrity of his life.  
 II. Caesar was esteemed for his humanity and benevolence;  
 III. austereness had given dignity to Cato.”

Pronouns *iste* and *idem* (“the same”) were only shortly described because they do not occur in the corpus at all. *Iste* is claimed to be connected with the 2<sup>nd</sup> person, and therefore occurs rather in speeches or dialogues than in narrative texts. The identifying *idem* is more frequently used in [Spec, NP] position. As it expresses identity of antecedent and postcedent, it is a “pure” anaphoric pronoun and would be a very suitable subject of a further anaphora research.

Another exclusively anaphoric pronoun is *is*, the most unmarked choice of pronominal postcedent, because it has no spatial and other connotations (cf. description of other pronouns). It is also used (together with *omnes*) as plural postcedent of split antecedents, similarly to *hic*.

This overview is only an attempt to capture the most significant properties of the use of pronouns. A more profound analysis is necessary that would include also other factors than only syntactic roles of antecedents and postcedents, e. g. structure of sentences or semantic types of subordinate clauses should be taken into account. Moreover, relations between the empty subject *pro* and overt pronouns in subject positions should be considered.

The use of **R-expressions** in Latin is briefly sketched. First, the use of proper nouns to introduce and re-introduce prominent participant (cf. above) is exemplified:

- (24) I. *Apud Helvetios longe nobilissimus fuit et ditissimus Orgetorix*<sub>i</sub>.  
 II. *Is*<sub>i</sub> *M. Messala M. Pisone consulibus regni cupiditate inductus coniurationem nobilitatis fecit et civitati pro*<sub>i</sub> *persuasit, ut de finibus suis cum omnibus copiis exirent:*  
 III. *perfacile esse, cum virtute omnibus pro praestarent, totius Galliae imperio potiri.*  
 IV. *Id hoc facilius iis pro*<sub>i</sub> *persuasit, quod undique loci natura Helvetii continentur:*

*una ex parte flumine Rheno latissimo atque altissimo, qui agrum Helvetium a Germanis dividit, altera ex parte monte Iura altissimo, qui est inter Sequanos et Helvetios, tertia lacu Lemano et flumine Rhodano, qui provinciam nostram ab Helvetiis dividit. His rebus fiebat ut et minus late pro vagarentur et minus facile finitimis bellum inferre pro possent; qua ex parte homines bel-landi cupidi magno dolore adficiabantur. Pro multitudine autem hominum et pro gloria belli atque fortitudinis angustos se fines habere arbitrabantur, qui in longitudinem milia passuum CCXL, in latitudinem CLXXX patebant.*

V. *His rebus adducti et auctoritate Orgetorigis, permoti constituerunt ea quae ad proficiscendum pertinerent comparare, [...] (Caes. B Gall. 1, 2 (1 – 5) – 3 (1))*

“I. Among the Helvetii, **Orgetorix** was by far the most distinguished and wealthy.

II. **He**, when Marcus Messala and Marcus Piso were consuls, incited by lust of sovereignty, formed a conspiracy among the nobility, and persuaded the people to go forth from their territories with all their possessions,

III. [saying] that it would be very easy, since they excelled all in valor, to acquire the supremacy of the whole of Gaul.

IV. To this **he** the more easily persuaded them, because the Helvetii, are confined on every side by the nature of their situation; on one side by the Rhine, a very broad and deep river, which separates the Helvetian territory from the Germans; on a second side by the Jura, a very high mountain, which is [situated] between the Sequani and the Helvetii; on a third by the Lake of Geneva, and by the river Rhone, which separates our Province from the Helvetii. From these circumstances it resulted, that they could range less widely, and could less easily make war upon their neighbors; for which reason men fond of war [as they were] were affected with great regret. They thought, that considering the extent of their population, and their renown for warfare and bravery, they had but narrow limits, although they extended in length 240, and in breadth 180 miles.

V. Induced by these considerations, and influenced by the authority of **Orgetorix**, they determined to provide such things as were necessary for their expedition [...]”

Afterwards, definite NPs are discussed, first such of them which contain an overt identifier, i. e. a pronoun in [Spec, NP] position (cf. above). There are also cases where there is no explicit identifier, and still the NP is interpreted as definite. According to Fugier (1994), it can be conditioned by its clause-initial position which signifies in itself the definiteness of the sentence constituent in question; consequently, definite constituents in other positions or indefinite constituents in initial position require additional marking by other means.

(25) Ia. *Caesar,*

II. *quod memoria tenebat L. Cassium consulem occisum exercitumque eius ab Helvetiis, pulsum et sub iugum missum,*

Ib. *concedendum non putabat;*

III. *neque homines inimico animo, data facultate per provinciam itineris faciundi, temperaturos ab iniuria et maleficio existimabat. (Caes. B Gall. 1, 7, 4 - 5)*

“Ia. Caesar,

II. inasmuch as he kept in remembrance that Lucius Cassius, the consul, had been slain, and his army routed and made to pass under the yoke by the Helvetii,

Ib. did not think that [their request] ought to be granted:

III. nor was he of opinion that men of hostile disposition, if an opportunity of marching through the Province were given them, would abstain from outrage and mischief.”

Definiteness of an NP can be further signaled by its character as unique or unalienably possessed object. Finally, general nouns which Rosén (1994) describes as “semantically empty (pronominal) substantives” are interpreted as definite:

- (26) I. *At omnium impeditis animis **Dumnorix**; cum equitibus Aeduorum a castris insciente Caesare domum discedere coepit.*  
 II. *Qua re nuntiata Caesar intermissa profectioe atque omnibus rebus postpositis magnam partem equitatus ad **eum**; insequendum mittit retrahique imperat;*  
 III. *si vim **pro**; faciat neque **pro**; pareat, interfici iubet, nihil **hunc**; se absente pro sano facturum arbitratus, qui praesentis imperium neglexisset.*  
 IV. ***Ille**; enim revocatus resistere ac se manu defendere suorumque fidem implorare coepit, saepe clamitans liberum **se**; liberaeque esse civitatis.*  
 V. *Illi, ut erat imperatum, circumstant **hominem**; atque interficiunt: at equites Aedui ad Caesarem omnes revertuntur. (Caes. B Gall. 5, 7, 5 - 9)*

“I. But, while the minds of all were occupied, Dumnorix began to take his departure from the camp homeward with the cavalry of the Aedui, Caesar being ignorant of it.

II. Caesar, on this matter being reported to him, ceasing from his expedition and deferring all other affairs, sends a great part of the cavalry to pursue him, and commands that he be brought back;

III. he orders that if he use violence and do not submit, that he be slain; considering that Dumnorix would do nothing as a rational man while he himself was absent, since he had disregarded his command even when present.

IV. He, however, when recalled, began to resist and defend himself with his hand, and implore the support of his people, often exclaiming that ‘he was free and the subject of a free state.’

V. They surround and kill **the man** as they had been commanded; but the Aeduan horsemen all return to Caesar.”

### Chapter 3: Conclusion

Chapter 3 contains an overview of the results of the research and concluding remarks. It is obvious that being based by the nature of material available, i. e. carefully written literary texts of the highest standard, created by well-educated writers, influenced by editors, the analysis of Latin anaphoric items cannot be complete and exhausting. It describes only the part of language which is made accessible in the texts. Colloquial language, not touched by stylistic refinements, is not captured by it. Nevertheless, in my opinion the analysis makes a good starting point of a further analysis which should include other types of texts as well and possibly also comparison of the use of anaphoric items in different kinds of them.

### Selected bibliography

- **Bertocchi, A. (1989):** “The Role of Antecedents of Latin Anaphors”, in: Calboli, G. (ed.): *Subordination and Other Topics in Latin. Proceedings of the Third Colloquium on Latin Linguistics*, John Benjamin, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: 441 – 461 (SLCS 17)
- **Bolkestein, A. M. and M. Van de Grift (1994):** “Participant tracking in Latin discourse”, in: Herman, J. (ed.): *Linguistic Studies on Latin. Selected Papers from the 6<sup>th</sup>*

- Colloquium on Latin Linguistics (Budapest, 23 – 27 March 1991)*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: 283 - 302 (SLCS 28)
- **Conte, M.-E. (1994):** “Discontinuity in texts”, in: Čmejrková, S. and F. Štícha (eds.): *The syntax of sentence and text, A festschrift for Franišek Daneš*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: 195 - 204 (Linguistic & Literary Studies in Eastern Europe 42)
  - **Fugier, H. (1991):** “Nominal anaphora, text, argumentation (from Plautus to Cicero)”, in: Coleman, R. (ed.): *New Studies in Latin Linguistics*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: 381 – 399 (SLCS 21)
  - **Givón, T. (1995):** *Functionalism and Grammar*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia
  - **Haegeman, L. (1994<sup>2</sup>):** *Introduction to Government and Binding Theory*, Blackwell, Oxford, UK/Cambridge, USA
  - **Halliday, M. A. K. and R. Hasan (1976):** *Cohesion in English*, Longman, London
  - **Harweg, R. (1968):** *Pronomina und Textkonstitution*, Wilhelm Fink Verlag, München (Beihefte zu Poetica, Heft 2)
  - **Huang, Y. (1994):** *The syntax and pragmatics of anaphora: A study with special reference to Chinese*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 70)
  - **Kühner, R and C. Stegmann (1912a):** *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. 1. Teil: Elementar-, Formen- und Wortlehre*, Wissenschaftliche Buchhandlung, Darmstadt
  - **Kühner, R and C. Stegmann (1912b):** *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. 2. Teil: Satzlehre, 1. Band*, Wissenschaftliche Buchhandlung, Darmstadt
  - **Kühner, R and C. Stegmann (1914):** *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. 2. Teil: Satzlehre, 2. Band*, Wissenschaftliche Buchhandlung, Darmstadt
  - **Langendoen, D. T. (1978):** “The logic of reciprocity”, *Linguistic Inquiry* 9/2: 177 – 197
  - **Maraldi, M. (1980):** “The complement structure of perception verbs in Latin”, in: Calboli, G. (ed.): *Papers on Grammar I*, CLUEB, Bologna: 47 - 79
  - **Maraldi, M. (1983):** “New approaches to Accusative subjects: Case Theory vs. Raising”, in: Pinkster, H. (ed.): *Latin Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: 167 – 176 (SLCS 12)
  - **Palek, B. (1968):** *Cross-reference: A study from hyper-syntax*, Universita Karlova, Praha (AUC - philologica monographia XXI – 1968)
  - **Palek, B. (1988):** *Referenční výstavba textu*, Univerzita Karlova, Praha
  - **Palek, B. (1989):** “Prázdne kategorie a slovosled”, *Bulletin ruského jazyka a literatury* XXX: 221-235
  - **Reinhart, T. and E. Reuland (1993):** “Reflexivity”, *Linguistic Inquiry* 24/4: 657 – 720
  - **Rosén, H. (1994):** “The definite article in making, nominal constituent order, and related phenomena”, in: Herman, J. (ed.): *Linguistic Studies on Latin. Selected Papers from the 6<sup>th</sup> Colloquium on Latin Linguistics (Budapest, 23 – 27 March 1991)*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: 129 – 150 (SLCS 28)